

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the final rejection dated May 18, 2009, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider his rejection for the reasons set forth hereinbelow.

Initially, the undersigned would like to thank Examiner Heinrich for the courtesies extended during a telephone discussion held with the undersigned on July 27, 2009. During the said telephone discussion, the outstanding Office action was discussed in detail and Applicant's representative presented arguments traversing the Examiner's rejection of pending claims 8-14. The arguments presented by Applicant's representative to Examiner Heinrich will be set forth hereinbelow.

The present invention is drawn to a method for securing a rotational symmetrical part to a hub part along an axial direction. The method comprises the steps of inserting the hub part into an opening of the rotational part wherein the contact surface of the hub part engages a contact surface of the rotational symmetrical part in an interference fit to produce an angular deviation of the functional surface from a first position to a second position. Thereafter, the hub part is welded to the rotational symmetrical part at the point of contact of the contact surfaces to produce an angular deviation from the second position back to the first position. It is respectfully submitted that the prior art cited by the Examiner fails to recognize the problem or the solution to which the method of the instant invention is drawn.

The Examiner rejected previously submitted independent claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of the '408 document to Fraser taken with the '165 document to Warren et al. It is respectfully submitted that

none of the prior art references teach or suggest the limitations set forth in independent method claim 8. AAPA does not recognize the problem which occurs when press fitting a hub into a rotational symmetrical part. There is nothing in the AAPA which recognizes that such an interference fit produces "an angular deviation of the functional surface from a first position to a second position". This problem is overcome by the method of the present invention by a further welding step which is made specifically "to produce an angular deviation of the functional surface from the second position to the first position". The AAPA does not recognize the problem nor the solution which the method of the instant invention is drawn.

The '408 document to Fraser likewise does not recognize the problem and, therefore, clearly does not recognize the solution. The '408 document deals with a method for repairing turbine blades and not a method for securing a rotational symmetrical part to a hub part. The '408 patent teaches that the tennon and blade part must be offset to compensate for distortion which might occur as a result of welding the tennon to the blade. The '408 document does not recognize the problems which the instant method is addressed nor the solution as reflected in independent claim 8. The Examiner cites as a tertiary reference the '165 document to Warren et al. Warren et al. merely teaches a weld connection between a shaft and a hub. Again, as with the primary and secondary references, the '165 patent to Warren et al. does not recognize the problem which the instant method is drawn nor the solution as set forth in independent claim 8.

The Examiner rejected previously submitted dependent claims 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over the same references noted above with regard to independent claim 8 in

further view of the '138 document to Gibson. Initially, it should be noted that the Gibson document likewise fails to recognize the problem which the instant method is drawn nor the solution to the aforesaid problem as reflected in independent claim 8. Furthermore, it is submitted that dependent claims 11, 12 and 13 contain patentable merit in their own right. Providing an encircling groove which is deformed to produce an angular deviation which is thereafter compensated for by welding as set forth in dependent claim 11 is not at all suggested in the prior art.

In addition, with regard to dependent claim 12, the specific location of the radiuses with respect to the side of the weld as claimed in dependent claim 12 is not at all shown in the prior art.

With regard to dependent claim 13, the specific location of the conical shape to provide for the angular deviation is not at all suggested in the prior art.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims as pending patentably define over the art of record and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider his rejection and issue a formal notice of allowance.

An earnest and thorough attempt has been made by the undersigned to resolve the outstanding issues in this case and place same in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or feels that a telephone or personal interview would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues which remain in this application after consideration of this amendment, the Examiner is courteously invited to telephone the undersigned and the same would be gratefully appreciated.

Apln. SN 10/551,638
Req. for Reconsideration Dated August 11, 2009
Reply to Office Action of May 18, 2009

If any fees are required in connection with this case, it
is respectfully requested that they be charged to Deposit
Account No. 02-0184.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Gregory P. LaPointe #28395/
Gregory P. LaPointe
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 28,395

Telephone: 203-777-6628
Telefax: 203-865-0297

Date: August 11, 2009